






MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy to the DCI for Resource Management


FROM: John F. Blake
Deputy Director for Administration

SUBJECT: Satellite Reconnaissance Security
Policy Alternatives 

25X1

1.  We have reviewed the final issue paper on Satellite Reconnaissance Security Policy Alternatives and find the paper basically incorporates the conflicting views of the differing parties on this matter. It would appear that probably more weight was given in the editing process to the State/ACDA position of opting for declassification of "fact of" without further study.

2.  We did note that under the heading IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS, the final paper confines those concerns as solely related to release of imagery. The point was made more than once to OSTP that we believed that these considerations applied to both declassification of "fact of" and release of imagery, and that the original Work Group paper had stated it in that fashion. It was our belief that OSTP had agreed to incorporate that belief into the paper during a final consultation last week.

3.  The paper contains some unfortunate redundancies which we attribute to hurried editing but, since the paper is now on the street, it is not worth dwelling on at this time.

4. ☐ We believe that the points that need to be addressed during the Space Policy Review Council (SPRC) meeting include:

a. Declassification of "fact of" solely for SALT II without proof of capability, i.e. release of imagery, is an empty shell which will not convert any Doubting Thomases.

b. The thought of merely informing the Soviets of our declassification intentions as opposed to entering into consultation with them strikes us as ill advised in view of past Soviet concerns. The State Department representative should be asked to shed light on this problem as well as advising if there have been any recent discussions with the USSR in this area. The same would apply vis-a-vis the allies and the lesser Developed Countries.

c. Assuming all agree that at least some imagery must be released to reflect the ability of the United States to monitor arms verification, an expression of concern should be made to reflect Intelligence Community concern about enabling the USSR to take action to take better protective and concealment action against observation.

d. We continue to be concerned with the possible loss of classified information with the declassification of "fact of." Although the paper suggests that a security plan to maintain intelligence discipline, there will remain a body of formerly cleared people who will react with a variety of interpretations over the meaning of declassification of "fact of" and some will undoubtedly believe that such declassification includes declassification of "facts about," and this may do serious harm to overhead collection programs.

e. Most importantly, we understand there are political reasons for desiring an immediate decision to declassify, followed by development of an implementation plan. However, we are hard pressed to understand why any adviser would suggest to the President that he make a decision without adequate prior staffing. We would hope that the DCI, or his representative, would raise that point at the SPRC and recommend that the suggested two month study be undertaken prior to a decision to declassify "fact of."

25 5. [] We will continue to follow this issue with interest as it makes its way toward decision.

John F. Blake

Distribution:

Orig - Adse
1 - DDA
1 - DDA Registry
1 - D/Sec
1 - D/Sec
1 - OS Registry
1 - SECOM Subj
① - SECOM Chrono

2 SECOM [] (7 Sept 78)